DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 913 IR 057 216

AUTHOR	Esmonde, Gary
TITLE	Adult Writing Programs in Ohio Public Libraries: Two Case Studies.
PUB DATE	1998-04-00
NOTE	55p.; Master's Research Paper, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses (040) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; *Adult Programs; Case Studies; Interviews; Library Research; Library Role; *Library Services; Program Administration; Program Content; Program Effectiveness; *Public Libraries; Questionnaires; *Writing (Composition); *Writing Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	Ohio (Northeast)

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on a study in which case studies of two adult writing programs in northeastern Ohio were developed to identify and describe elements that make up the programs. Data was gathered through obtrusive observation, interviews, and questionnaires. Both programs had been on going for at least 5 years. The "Geauga Writers Workshop" at Middlefield Library is a forum for readings and feedback of individual writings of participants. "Write on, Cleveland!" is housed at the East Cleveland Public Library and involves guest speakers within the writing profession who offer advice on how to publish and market. Though the programs are structured differently, similar components were identified as important to the effectiveness of both programs. Research found uniqueness, dedication of the program presenter, and administrative support to be such components. Certain elements such as lack of promotion, the autonomy of the presenter, and lack of evaluation suggest that improvements can be made. By comparing the variables of the two programs, this paper provides suggestions for model development with implementation possibilities. Nine appendices contain program schedules; program participant, presenter, and library administration consent forms; participant program evaluation; questionnaire return rates; presenter and library administrator interview questions; and field notes. (Author/DLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 913

ADULT WRITING PROGRAMS IN OHIO PUBLIC LIBRARIES: TWO CASE STUDIES

A Master's Research Paper submitted to the
Kent State University School of Library
and Information Science
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Master of Library Science

by

Gary Esmonde

April, 1998

IR057216

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. P. Wallace
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ADULT WRITING PROGRAMS IN OHIO PUBLIC LIBRARIES: TWO CASE STUDIES

ABSTRACT

Case studies of two adult writing programs in northeastern Ohio were developed to identify and describe elements that make up the programs. Data was gathered through obtrusive observation, interviews, and questionnaires. Both programs have been on-going for at least five years. The Geauga Writers Workshop at Middlefield Library is a forum for readings and feedback of individual writings of the participants. Write On, Cleveland! is housed at the East Cleveland Public Library and involves guest speakers within the writing profession who offer advice on how to publish and market. Even though the programs were structured differently, similar components were identified as important to the effectiveness of both programs. Research found uniqueness, dedication of the program presenter , and administrative support to be such components. Likewise, certain elements such as lack of promotion, the autonomy of the presenter, and lack of evaluation suggest improvements can be made. By comparing the variables of the two programs, this paper provides suggestions for model development with implementation possibilities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		
ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study	3
	Definitions of Terms	4
	Limitations of the Study	4
TWO	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
THREE	METHODOLOGY	9
FOUR	CASE STUDY OF MIDDLEFIELD WRITING PROGRAM	11
	Program	11
	Presenter Interview	14
	Administration Interview	17
	Questionnaire Results	18
FIVE	CASE STUDY OF EAST CLEVELAND WRITING PROGRAM	20
	Program	20
	Presenter Interview	23
	Administration Interview	25
	Questionnaire Results	26
SIX	DISCUSSION	28
SEVEN	CONCLUSION	34
APPENDIXES		
A	Schedules	35
B	Program Participant Consent Form	36
C	Presenter Consent Form	37
D	Administration Consent Form	38
E	Questionnaire	39
F	Questionnaire Return Rates	43
G	Presenter Questions	44
H	Administration Questions	45
I	Summary of Field Notes	46
REFERENCE LIST		50

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Writing instruction for adults is characterized by the uneasy mixture of demand and limited opportunity. As an older population reveals an eagerness to learn, public libraries need to be sensitive to such developments and offer services accordingly.

Adult learning needs and abilities have evolved from recognition of adult education as a discipline toward theories of lifelong learning. In relation to this expanded perception, Patricia Cross (1978) indicated 79% of adults engage in a learning activity. Motivations, as found by Alan Tough (1979) for such engagements, include preparing for a job, updating skills, dealing with home and personal responsibilities, occupying leisure, and satisfying curiosity about a particular subject. Connie Van Fleet (1990) found the concept of lifelong learning to be interdisciplinary and reflecting the need of humans to change and grow. Trends in sociology and psychology recognize adaptations for survival and continual transitions as reinforcing the importance of lifelong learning. Our vision of the world, our ability to relate past and present to the future, and our sense of consequence are breaking down according to Marty Knowlton (1993). We must examine traditional methods that provide knowledge and look toward lifelong learning for possible solutions.

Writing is an effective tool for stimulating interests and learning more about them. Alice Brand (1980) noted that bibliotherapy and modern therapeutic thinking recognizes writing as helping people explore the meaning of their own experiences so that they can participate in life. Such exploration does not necessarily indicate mental instability. People can not go back and undo anything. But through the transformative powers of writing, they can reshape what they think of themselves and go on. Frank Smith (1994, 17) observed that things "happen when we write" that can clearly be for

1

ourselves as easily as for others. Joanne Arrant (1995) further explored the connection between writing and healing mental states of being stuck or troubled. Creative writing can produce a balance between sharing poems and stories with others and our private occupations through journals and letters. By writing we become familiar with ourselves by finding our own voices, finding a way to let ourselves be heard. The act of writing was, as argued by Robert Parker and Vera Goodwin (1987), to be seen as a theory of learning in which new experience or information must be used in order to be constructed as knowledge. Through writing we take what we know and reinvent ideas to reflect our intentions and not someone else's. Sheridan Baker (1983) concluded that writing is a way of learning that moves emotional expression toward rational thinking. Writing, then, is important both as a process and a product. We give value to our creations which, in turn, are valuable in defining us.

In spite of this propensity to learn, there are limited opportunities for adults within a structured setting to do so. Higher education, art centers, and job training offer viable alternatives. However, a survey by Patrick Pen land (1978) found that adults prefer learning independently. They want to set their own pace, use their own style of learning, and keep activities flexible. A lack of time for formal classes, money, and transportation were also revealing. It makes sense that public libraries offer an alternative where adults could learn in a low-cost, noncompetitive environment.

Public libraries exist to provide services for people. These services are of value only if they are valued by those who use them. What is confusing is understanding the differences between patron wants and needs. Many libraries concentrate their efforts to providing services for which there is a high demand. In contrast, Nick Moore (1989) believed public libraries should equally be concerned with the needs of patrons even though the patrons may not by themselves generate a high demand for a service provided. Public libraries are beginning to recognize the importance of such adult

programming that stimulates lifelong learning. Kathleen Molt (1979, 1) states that public libraries are "increasingly targeting services to the informal educational needs of individuals of all ages." Reflecting upon the silver anniversary of the Adult Education Act, Margaret Monroe and Kathleen Him commented on the support for mature readers through collaborative efforts between government agencies and professional organizations to bring humanities programming into libraries. The American Library Association (1997, 29) promotes a "learning society" that ensures "school, public, academic, and special libraries in every community cooperate to provide lifelong learning services to all." Adult programs thus support the mission of the American Library Association by providing the public with additional opportunities for education, information, and recreation.

In practice, public libraries can merge lifelong learning with personal and creative growth through writing. The existence of programs that transform such theory into practice provides the background for this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to construct case studies of two on-going adult writing programs in public libraries in order to gather information for a service model. The two programs are "Write-on! Cleveland", conducted by noted author Ted Schwarz on alternate Saturdays at East Cleveland Public Library (1410 Euclid Ave., East Cleveland, Ohio 44123-2091) and "Geauga Writers Workshop", moderated by author/librarian Linda Rome on the first Thursday of the month at the Middle field branch of the Geauga County Public Library (15982 E. High Street, Middle field, Ohio 44062). Both programs have been in service for at least five years. This exploratory study seeks foremost to describe writing programs and to discover their effectiveness and value. Looking at two different programs might yield more definitive results by reducing bias and generalizations. Parallels between the two programs can then be

drawn and used for model development.

Definitions of Terms

This study focuses on writing programs for adults as opposed for those geared for children and young adults. Although maturation and creativity involve many physiological, psychological, and social elements, the writing skills referred to here would not be beneficial to elementary and junior high school students. High school students could attend, but progress would depend on the individual. These programs, then, would primarily serve those who are eighteen or older.

Writing is defined in the study as any skills or applications that would encourage composition of a literary nature. These compositions are not limited to fiction, essays, memoirs, letters, journals, poetry, plays, articles, criticism, and biographies. The skills are not applied toward literacy development or reviewing grammatical mechanics. The focus is on writing for creative and personal satisfaction, not learning to write for the first time.

A program as defined here is any regularly scheduled series of presentations of at least six months duration that reflects the specific needs of a subgroup. This subgroup, as it is seen here, might have no other connection other than a shared interest in a topic. A program differs from a workshop in its length. It is not a one-time offering and for the purposes of this study, must be implemented by the library with no indication that it will end in the foreseeable future.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to writing programs that are being conducted in public libraries and any operations or observations are not generalizable to other types of libraries.

Also, both libraries within this study are in northeastern Ohio. The writing needs and abilities of patrons can be affected by the educational, social, and economic

factors of the surrounding community. Any findings of a library program of a specific region can not be indicative of all community profiles.

To see similarities and recognize differences between programs for future model development, controlled variables must be taken into account. These could include, but are not limited to: the size and staff of library, the scope and content of the program, the time, length, and duration of the program, the presenter, and the type of patron using the program. Understanding from comparing such variables, however, is affected by the low number of case studies.

Finally, the duration of the programs suggests their effectiveness. Also, evaluation by both the library administration and the presenter, as well as patron satisfaction, cannot be overlooked even though such interpretations will be of subjective value.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Most literature in the field focuses on either creative writing at academic libraries or writing centers outside the library environment. In reference to public libraries there are numerous studies and published results reflecting successful children's or young adult writing programs, but little regarding adults.

General descriptions of specific programs offer the most comprehensive approach to insight and understanding. Sheila B. Dickerson (1984) outlined her year as writer-in-residence to the Alaska State Library. The program was held at many locations and centered around three themes: how to get started in writing, how to improve your writing, and how to publish what you write. She analyzed other successful public library writing programs throughout the country and concluded the most effective writing programs are community-based, long-term, informal, and noncompetitive. A local writer developed and presided over a public library program in Durham, North Carolina that was highly received for over ten years. The program combined the study of classic literature and writing within the framework of structured courses. Two anthologies of prose and poetry offered the unique opportunity for publication and appreciation through the works and comments of the participants (Hogan 1989). In particular to Ohio, Tavern Hall (1995) compiled a bibliography of resources for writers that included brief descriptions of workshops and programs in public libraries. An updated edition is slated for the spring of 1998.

Identification of various components of programs can be used for model development. Such components of writing workshops were outlined by a manual published by Poets and Writers, Inc. (Ludlam 1980). Comparisons of the benefits of using emerging writers as presenters versus well-known authors were made. Basic

issues such as public relations, budgeting, and program presentation were also addressed. Moreover, Alan Ziegler (1981) emphasized within writing workshops the importance of the teacher as writer, reading out loud, measuring the progress of participants, and feedback. A more recent manual on adult programming published by the American Library Association (1997) again emphasized knowing one's community. Facts can be obtained through surveys and statistical resources. Publicity was stated to be crucial to a successful program as well. Methods of both free and paid advertising could include press releases, public service announcements, and photographs. Finally, responsibilities of a presenter of a humanities program have been suggested by Thea Ruin (1997) to include keeping participants alert and interested, allowing everyone an opportunity to speak, encouraging participation by all, valuing all contributions to the exchange, and asking stimulating questions.

Writing programs can also be defined by the people who use them. "The Tucson Writers' Project" at the Tucson-Pima Public Library has been in existence for over fifteen years, been offered in all sixteen branches and the bookmobile, and been taught by more than twenty authors. The program makes a concerted effort to reach all segments of the population (the terminally ill, recovering drug users, young adults and the elderly). A recent study found many participants were not from the immediate area and were using the branch libraries for the first time (Pellegrino 1995, 218-220). A look into The Chicago Public Library's "Writing in Chicago Program" found writing program participants used the library more and traveled a longer distance to attend their sessions than participants in other programs. (Wayward 1980). Branch programming was again recognized as a successful factor of the program's effectiveness. Participants stated the availability of a prominent author was the strongest source of satisfaction. Interviews of writers and librarians involved with adult writing programs stressed the importance of the connection between people's

identities and their communities (Bongartz 1982, 32-34). The response from participants to these programs reflects the importance of incorporating lifelong learning within library goals.

Funding is a major concern for developing and maintaining any program in a library. Local monies, state humanities and arts councils, federal assistance, and grants from private, non-profit organizations all offer possibilities for writing programs. Sandy Dolnick (1980) indicated Friends of Libraries organizations have traditionally raised funds for programs in excess of the general library budget. Charles G. Bolt (1977) surveyed the state humanities and arts councils and found that although arts councils reported overall less activity, there were more opportunities for creative writing. The Ohio Arts Council (1997) offers an artist-in-residence program with grants in poetry and creative writing.

The scarcity of literature and research about adult writing in public libraries suggests the importance of this study in both the description of individual programs and encouragement toward developing a model for implementation. As seen, the field is nearly void of any methodological approach to evaluating and understanding adult writing programs. Hopefully, this study will help fill such a void.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this research was a case study. This study involved unstructured observation, interviews, and questionnaires by the researcher. Consistency was obtained through attendance at each program for a minimum of four meetings each. Validity of the study was also sought through a comprehensive approach that strived to be both systematic and quantitative.

An obtrusive, active role within the programs was decided upon. Through a preliminary meeting with one presenter and a telephone conversation with the other, an agreement was established that such a role would be activated. An announcement of intention was made to participants at the beginning of the second meeting attended of each particular program. A summary of field notes of the meetings can be seen in Appendix I.

The exploration of a broad spectrum of categories included information about the presenter's role and qualifications. To achieve this, consent forms (Appendix C) were distributed and oral interviews with core questions (Appendix G) were conducted with both program presenters. The library's role and support were important as well and interviews with library administration were conducted. These consent forms (Appendix D) and core questions (Appendix H) are also included. A schedule of all program meetings and interviews is included in Appendix A.

Participant comments were crucial to any understanding of how the programs worked. To this end, questionnaires asking for information on the effectiveness of the programs, usage of the library, and personal background were developed. Cover letters (Appendix B), stamped envelopes, and questionnaires (Appendix E) were then distributed to patrons of the programs attended by the researcher.

9

Data collected from records, direct observations, interviews, and questionnaires was incorporated into an objective description of each writing program. Such detailed examinations can be applied directly to the effectiveness of the programs. A comparison between programs was made for a better understanding and identification of components for model development

CHAPTER FOUR

CASE STUDY OF MIDDLE FIELD WRITING PROGRAM

The Middle field Library is located at 15982 East High Street in Middle field, Ohio and is a branch of the Geauga County Public Library system. The four branches and two stations of the county system share an online union catalog with the Burton Public Library. The Middle field Library was established in 1942. In 1973, the existing buildings (a house and storefront) were razed and and the present building was constructed. The one floor plan consists of a large room for the library collection, circulation desk, rooms for staff and technical services, restrooms, and a meeting room. Specialized areas of the collection include reference resources, periodicals, audio-visual, and children's. There are currently two on-going adult programs at the time of this study: the book discussion group and the Geauga Writers Workshop. The community served has a population of 2185 within Middle field village, 4111 within Middle field Township, and 81,129 covering Geauga County. The per capita income is $17, 587, with 25.9% of the population having at least sixteen years of education. The area is predominately white (98.2%).

Program

The Geauga Writers Workshop meets on the first Thursday of the month at 6:30PM. The sessions observed took place in the meeting room, which had more than adequate seating and table space. There was easy maneuverability for wheelchairs. Although the room appeared overly bright and the seating uncomfortable (metal folding chairs), no one seemed to be distracted. Likewise, the adjacency of two schools and a parking lot did not seem to disrupt and the room was very quiet.

This workshop was developed and moderated by a professional writer who was also a part-time reference librarian at the library. The primary focus was to

develop creative writing skills by discussing individual works. This was achieved by by workshop exercises and encouraging participants to bring in works-in-progress, ideas, and final drafts. A small flyer by the main door reinforced the purpose of the workshop. Identification of the workshop and moderator, date, time, and a credential of the moderator were listed. Then, the flyer urged the public to "Please join us. Come to listen or come to share your writing. We're informal and supportive. All are welcome." At the bottom were the words CHILDREN'S NON-FICTION POETRY FICTION to suggest the different genres that would be covered. The groups were small (of the four meetings attended by the researcher for the study the number of participants ranged from three to six) and it was observed that regulars made up the majority of the group every time. Everyone who did attend during those four meetings had brought work to be reviewed at least once. Twice, two of the regulars did not offer anything due to conflicting time demands. The range of individual material discussed in the meetings covered all of the four genres listed in the flyer. There were novel excerpts, stories, poems, children's stories, essays, and memoirs. Writing exercises encouraged journal writing, informal essays, and stream of consciousness expression.

Each meeting was loosely conducted in the same way. Announcements of local writing events and next meeting's date would be made. Progress of each participant's writings would be reported. Resources and different types of creative writing would then be covered by the presenter. Printed copies of such resources would be passed around and usually the presenter would read a few passages. Next, writing exercises were given. Sometimes there would be two or three, depending on the presenter's judgment of time remaining in order to cover individual work. Finally, each participant was allowed to read work aloud to the group. A short discussion followed that offered suggestions for creative improvement, grammatical changes, organization, and marketing and submission strategies. Never once was a participant

interrupted during a reading, nor was quantity or quality a factor. All work brought was covered (sometimes three pieces by one participant) and all work was encouraged to be shared. As mentioned in the methodology, the researcher made known his intentions to study the group as well as be an active participant. The response was favorable and no one was observed to act differently.

The presenter of the program, Linda Rome, was organized and professional. As stated, she is a part-time reference librarian. One of her shifts includes Thursday evenings, so another staff member covers the reference desk while she does the workshop. Consequently, she was never late. However, the library closed at 8:00 PM on Thursdays and the program naturally was to end at that time. But at all four meetings attended, the program ran over (once to 9:30 PM). The rest of the library was closed, but the program ran to its own conclusion. Since she was only paid as a librarian to conduct this workshop during library hours, there was no compensation for extra time. Such efforts reflected not only the presenter's dedication to the success of the program, but her interest toward each participant, as she made sure everyone had time to read his/her work and have adequate feedback from others. She also talked of her personal writing progress and participated in the writing exercises as well. Having a professional writer's experiences and presentations added a valuable dimension to the group. She was never pretentious and never brought outside work.

The presenter was extremely supportive and gave positive encouragement to all efforts. Components of a successful workshop as described by Ziegler and fundamental responsibilities of an effective presenter outlined by Ruin (See REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE), were repeatedly observed to be recognized as characteristics of the presenter. Each participant had equal opportunity to present work. Each participant also had an opportunity to express opinions about work that was read. The presenter always started the conversation with asking for general comments. She

would offer her thoughts first only if the group was stalled. Although the feedback was a democratic process, the atmosphere was subtly controlled by the presenter. She would pitch her voice in encouragement and maintained a more controlled tone when she tried to make examples where something else might work better or to a different effect. The presenter's tone and support reflected the approach of other comments from the group as most all the feedback offered was taken seriously by the writer. The participants enjoyed hearing their work praised and positive reinforcement was given to acknowledge the effort and to have the participant become interested in making changes. Criticism was not ignored, but rather presented in a way that suggested possibilities for improvement. Most writers would write down suggestions. Finally, the presenter encouraged each participant to bring back work-in-progress and also to try to publish or submit finished work to appropriate markets. Two participants did bring back updated work that was presented at an earlier meeting.

Presenter Interview

A three-hour interview was conducted with Linda Rome on March 6, 1998. A consent form for the interview and information about the study was sent and signed by the presenter (see Appendix C). The approach of the interview and following report were based on a core set of questions (see Appendix G).

Linda Rome is a part-time reference librarian at the Middle field Library. She has a M.L.S. degree and has been with the library for about ten years. She is also a professional writer, with published poems and articles in various periodicals such as *McCall's*, *Library Journal*, and *Wilson Library Bulletin*. She was editor of *Ohio Writer* magazine for five years and currently is a syndicated columnist for the *Catholic News* wire service.

The idea for an adult creative writing group at Middle field was originally Ms. Rome's. Because patrons knew Ms. Rome was a writer, they would occasionally ask

her opinions on their creative work while she was working in reference. Some would bring in their manuscripts. Eventually, Ms. Rome saw a need within the community to offer programs for creative writing as she could not offer her expertise during her other duties. Initially, the program started as one-time offerings on journal writing and family history. Soon, however, the program had a more permanent setting with the creation of the Geauga Writers Workshop. To Ms. Rome's recollection, the program has been in existence for nearly five years.

The workshop has always been the first Thursday of the month at 6:30PM. From the beginning, the concept was hands-on evaluation of creative writing by adults. A small group of participants permits more individual attention. Indeed, a good turnout has about six to eight participants, and there have never been fewer than three. Ms. Rome estimates that over fifty people have been in the program, many staying for months. There are usually five to six regulars at any given time. At first, the program was structured around themes, such as point of view or characterization. Now, the program is more informal. There has always been referral to writing resources, writing exercises, and discussions of individual work. There have, on a rare occasions, been guest writers.

Each workshop is prepared and moderated by Linda Rome. If she is ill or cannot do the workshop, it is canceled and the library will call the regulars. She sees her role as a moderator meaning "to stay on that line" and not be overly influential. She strongly urges individual readings and an opportunity for feedback and encouragement for writers at all levels. She is very confident the workshop provides a viable service. She estimates about two hours of preparation goes into each workshop, usually done on the day of the presentation. As professional writer, she feels more than qualified to organize the material and oversee the discussions and comments of the participants' work. A concern to both Ms. Rome and library

administration is that preparation sometimes occurs during her library shift and takes her away from reference duties.

As mentioned, the workshop was Ms. Rome's idea and was encouraged by the library administration. It was agreed that Ms. Rome would be responsible for developing, promoting, and presenting the workshop. The time spent conducting the workshop would call for additional staff at the reference desk on Thursday nights once a month. The library is thus supporting the program for about three to four hours a month of Ms. Rome's salary, if preparation work is included. This comes out of the staff budget. There are no monies for public relations of the program from the library's budget. Support is also given by the library administration to Linda Rome through her autonomy of the program. The library administration has never placed any limitations or posed any suggestions.

In Ms. Rome's estimation, existence of the program itself is a measurement of its effectiveness. Participants' work had demonstrated real improvement in technique and ability. Some participants have used the program regularly, others on a more sporadic nature. Some have shared long projects. Local poets have benefited from the meetings and others have been published, crediting their success directly to the program. True effectiveness, Ms.Rome notes, is trying to meet individuals at their level and providing a supportive environment in which to grow. She has never received any negative response to the program.

The program has been announced in the library's newsletter and the local paper, but basically public relations have been hindered by both time and budget. On occasion, Ms. Rome has prepared releases herself on her own time and recognizes this as a priority to the success of the program. Time constraints, however, have limited her ability to do so. More public relations and more financial support to attend these goals are changes Ms. Rome would like to see. She plans to continue to do the

Geauga Writers Workshop as long as she is a librarian at Middle field.

Administration Interview

An hour-long interview was conducted with Barb Luther on March 17, 1998. A consent form for the interview and information about the study was sent and signed by the administrator (see Appendix D). The approach of the interview and following report were based on a core set of questions (see Appendix H).

Barb Luther is manager of the Middle field branch of the Geauga County Library system. In relation to this case study, she was also one of the library administrative personnel that Linda Rome first approached with the idea of the writing program.

Since there were no library records of the program in terms of its history and development, Ms. Luther deferred all details to such matters to Linda Rome. She agreed that the sole responsibility of the programs lay with Linda Rome. Ms. Luther also acknowledged that the program has been the first Thursday evening of the month at 6:30PM and since Ms. Rome works only fourteen hours a week (Sundays and Thursdays), Ms. Luther believes the library's support of allowing a part-time reference librarian to pursue this service is commendable.

The early history of patrons bothering Linda Rome with writing tips at the reference desk was remembered, as well as telephone calls with similar requests. Ms. Luther asserts the program does eliminate needless personal guidance at the expense of the reference staff and that the program does provide a valuable service to the community.

Ms. Luther allocates about three hours a month from the staff budget to support the program. As indicated, the program is not funded in any way through the library's public relations monies. When told of Ms. Rome's concerns for more financial support, Ms. Luther suggested approaching Friends of the Library for further support if needed.

Further evidence of the library administration's support is their complete trust

in Linda Rome's credentials as a writer and her professionalism as a librarian. To Ms. Luther's memory, no library personnel have attended the workshop. There were no evaluation meetings concerning the program's effectiveness and no one had ever made limitations or suggestions concerning the program in any way. But she noted, as long as Ms. Rome was presenter of the program and working there, the program would continue to exist and have administrative support.

Questionnaire Results

Questionnaires, consent forms, and stamped return envelopes were given to participants of the program at the last two meetings attended by the researcher. Since the groups were small, the researcher physically handed copies to all the different participants (the presenter gave the researcher the name and address of a regular and one questionnaire was also sent to that participant). The results are based on six questionnaires sent out and six received. A copy of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix E and the program participant consent form is in Appendix B. Furthermore, return rates to the questionnaires of both programs are represented in Appendix F.

Two-thirds (4) of the participants were female and most attending were Caucasian (5). Ages ranged between 31 to 75 years. All participants that answered about their educational level stated they had some college experience and two-thirds of the participants who did the questionnaire had studied on the graduate level or had a graduate degree. Of interest was the background information given on occupations, which included education, business, services, management, and professional.

In regard to library use by the participants other than attending the workshop, all stated they used the library within the last year. Frequency ran the course from 3 to 6 times a week to 3 to 6 times a year. The answers were too evenly distributed in between to suggest any pattern. Service use was also varied, although all participants stated they borrowed materials and obtained information from resources

within the library. Half (3) of the questionnaires revealed information was also obtained from a librarian and one-third (2) responded that they received information through a delivery service (all wrote that it was interlibrary loans) and used OPLIN terminals. In reference to library programs excluding the writing workshop, the majority of participants said they had never attended a program at Middlefield before, but all planned to attend more programs in the future.

Results pertaining to the writing workshop itself were not surprising after observing the program and the presenter. Nearly all (5) indicated the opportunity for intellectual stimulation as an initial attraction to the program. Two-thirds were also specifically interested in the topic. Half knew the presenter and signed for that reason. and exactly half also were attracted to the convenient location (although someone noted just the opposite). One participant liked that the program was free. All participants stated that the single aspect of greatest value was the contribution of the presenter. Many (4) believed hearing what others had to say was of great value. Half thought sharing work with others was also of great value. One participant, who like everyone else thought highly of the presenter's value, saw little value in hearing the comments of others or sharing work. Most (5) participants, however, saw all aspects of the program to be of moderate and/or great value. As a learning experience, all participants agreed that the presenter was excellent as a teacher and in encouraging writing. All but one also agreed that the presenter was excellent in drawing people out. The one who disagreed stated the presenter was actually poor in this regard. Acquired writing skills and group participation were spilt evenly between good and excellent learning experiences. The program location and relevance of the topics did not seem as important, as a few blanks showed up. Overall quality of the program was rated excellent by two-thirds.

CHAPTER FIVE

CASE STUDY OF EAST CLEVELAND WRITING PROGRAM

The East Cleveland Public Library is located at 14101 Euclid Avenue in East Cleveland, Ohio. (This is the main library where the case study was conducted. There are also two smaller branch sites. All subsequent referrals will be to the main library.) The library was established in 1915 with the original building designed in the Dutch Renaissance style on land donated by the Rockefeller family and funding by Andrew Carnegie. In 1952, a west wing was added which now houses closed stacks, offices, technical services, and a GOD room. A major renovation from 1985 to 1991 has transformed the library into a state-of-the-art facility. New cabinetry, soft colors, and an exposed barrel vault ceiling are prominent features. Black History, Local History, and Computer Resource areas were added. The East Cleveland Library is also a member of the CLEVNET resource network. Other noted adult programs include the Adult Basic and Literacy Education Learning Lab classes, Jazz Sunday Series, and Job shop programs on resume preparation and career searches. The population of East Cleveland is 33, 918. The per capita income is $9, 946 and 12.3% have had 16 or more years of education. The community is predominately black (93.7 %).

Program

Write On, Cleveland! meets every other Saturday at 1:00PM. There were no posters or flyers of any kind within the library itself describing the program, so the researcher was unsure where to go when he attended the first meeting. That meeting took place in the GOD room, which is very small. An announcement by the presenter at that first meeting indicted that normally the program is conducted in the auditorium downstairs. The next three meetings attended by the researcher were in the auditorium, which had long folding tables to spread out at and take better notes. It was

noticed that wheelchair access to the GOD room would have been difficult. There were stairs descending into the auditorium as well, but the researcher noticed doors on ground level on both sides. The first meeting suffered from outside noises. The auditorium, however, was very quiet. There was also a raised stage in the auditorium so speakers could be easily seen and recognize participants when asking questions. A nice feature at the meetings was a table offering coffee and tea.

The program was moderated by a professional writer who scheduled other writers and experts to speak about various tools of writing and strategies for writing for different markets. The premise, as observed by the researcher, was to give tips to writers about both the art and business of selling their work. The topics of the four meetings attended were dictionaries, writing for parenting periodicals, public relations writing, and literary agents. The writer that was the presenter never indicated that the speakers were generously doing the programs for free. Only at the second meeting when the library director substituted for the absent presenter and introduced the guest speaker, was it announced that both the presenter and all guest speakers were donating their time and there was no compensation for their services. Another feature of the program was that the presenter offered personal assistance to anyone who asked. Work could be given to the presenter, who would then review the material outside of the program setting and return it with appropriate suggestions. However, the researcher did not know of this at the first two meetings because the service was never mentioned. After the end of the first program, participants were observed talking to the presenter and handing him material. Only when the presenter made general announcements at the beginning of the third meeting attended, was there any mention that such a service was part of the program. At that time, the presenter announced he did not have any work ready to give back, nor would he would receive any material. Again, nothing was ever mentioned at the fourth meeting.

21

Each meeting was set up primarily with the presenter introducing the guest speaker and then letting that person take over. First, the presenter would make general announcements, usually of upcoming speakers. The general impression made was that the presentor was very busy. He was responsible of getting the speakers and because of conflicting schedules and time constraints could not guarantee anything more than a few meetings at a time. After the presenter introduced the speaker, the program basically belonged to that person. They talked at length of the topic at hand, their personal backgrounds and experiences, and offered constructive advice for marketing and publishing. All talks were informative and organized. Breaks were given (except at the first meeting), which were followed by a question and answer period. All questions were taken seriously and answered to the speaker's best ability. The presenter added additional comments on two occasions.

The presenter was supportive and enthusiastic about whatever topic was being presented. It was observed that the presenter sat near the front of the audience after he announced the guest speaker, and was attentive throughout the rest of the program. He only talked to participants about individual work after all questions were answered and the speaker was done. Of the three meetings that the presenter was there, it was observed that he participated himself with asking questions, all which related to publishing. During the dictionary lecture ,for example, the presenter asked how writers could break into the writing/editing of dictionaries. Finally, it was noticed that the presenter was rushed for time at the end of one the programs. For the first and fourth meetings, he did meet with participants and talk about their work. At the third meeting, however, he mentioned he had to leave at 3:30 and could not stay.

The meetings were scheduled to run from 1:00PM to 5:00PM, but every meeting ended before 5:00PM. All the guest speakers and the presenter (at the first and fourth meetings) were generous with their time and patient to all lingering requests.

Presenter Interview

An hour-long interview was conducted with Ted Schwarz, the presenter and coordinator for Write On, Cleveland! on April 13, 1998. A consent form for the interview and information about the study was signed by the presenter at the interview (see Appendix C). The approach of the interview and following report were based on a core set of questions (see Appendix G).

Ted Schwarz is a best-selling author with over ninety published books in all fields except fantasy and poetry. He has been on the *New York Times Bestseller List*. He has published over 2000 articles and has been translated into eight languages. He is not a paid employee or affiliated with the East Cleveland Public Library.

The catalyst for the Write On, Cleveland! program originally started with an idea from the library director, Gregory Reese. He heard of Mr. Schwarz and asked him to do a writing seminar. Mr. Schwarz proposed a different set-up that featured guest speakers giving their time to encourage others in the field. He states he wanted "to give back to the community." To this effect, Mr. Schwarz has offered his time and talents for free since the beginning of the program. He strongly points out the the only function of this program is to help someone get published and did not see it so much as a library service but as a service to struggling writers. The program, to his knowledge, has been in existence for six years.

The program has always been alternative Saturdays at 1:00PM. The slot is structured to last till 5:00PM, but Mr. Schwarz indicates that two hours is what is expected from the guest speakers. Turnout depends on public relations and the topic and/or speaker. Normal figures are around two dozen (as in the four meetings attended by the researcher) to occasionally over 100. Regulars come and go, but Mr. Schwarz knows some participants come very irregularly depending on what is being presented. As well as guest speakers, guidance and assistance by Mr.Schwarz

has always been a feature from the program's conception. An early, two-page promotion of the program stated that "if you have an unusual circumstance or unique need, talk with Ted Schwarz. Your work, your problems, and your needs are confidential." Mr. Schwarz will review the material himself, or get in touch with someone else if another voice is needed. He has worked with an established poet for over six years on a writing project. A concern with the public relations department of the library over inadequate coverage of this service of the program, and exposure of the program itself, is a very important concern to Mr. Schwarz.

Each speaker is arranged to appear by Mr. Schwarz. He estimates he puts in 160 hours a year in scheduling and running the program. He is not involved with promotion of any kind. If a speaker cancels, Mr. Schwarz will speak on the topic at hand as best as he can and reschedule the speaker later. He emphasized repeatedly throughout the interview no one is paid for their services. Indeed, one speaker who was used to getting $2500/hr. did the program for free. He admits that a good writer does not mean a good speaker, and has had some meetings that went flat. Also, he is attentive of misinformation and will interject when appropriate.

Mr. Schwarz sees the value of the program through a writer's perspective. He acknowledges people have told him the program has been a major influence to their success as published writers. He told of one woman who was on welfare and of limited skills, then went on to become an editor and freelance writer for a trade journal. More importantly, he confesses the best measurement that the program is working is that a participant stops coming. He sees himself and the program as tools and services to help a writer learn and to give him guidance. A writer's desire and will must complete the equation.

The program's development and structure has always been maintained by Mr. Schwarz. The library does not limit or suggest in any way. Mr. Schwarz is proud

of the program and plans to continue with it. Ideally, he thinks it should be offered once a week, but that is not feasible given his busy schedule. He believes the program should be better promoted and is at odds with the library with the issue. This program, he says, is nationally known yet can only offer its services if it is better promoted.

Administration Interview

A two-hour interview was conducted with Gregory Reese on March 23, 1998. A consent form for the interview and information about the study was sent and signed by the administrator (see Appendix D). The approach of the interview and following report were based on a core set of questions. (see Appendix H).

Gregory Reese is director of the East Cleveland Public Library. As the library was going through a renovation of its physical structure, an idea became part of a metamorphosis of adult programming. Mr. Reese approached Ted Schwarz to do a writing program. His account was similar to Mr. Schwarz's in that the author agreed only if it was going to run indefinitely, involve volunteer time, and be free to the public. The program, Mr. Reese reflects, has been running with those ideas intact since the fall of 1992. Permanent records of the program and its list of speakers is kept by neither the library or Mr. Schwarz, but early newspaper releases collaborated what Mr. Reese told the researcher. The surrounding community is poor and black. A free arts program such as Write On, Cleveland! not only draws people from outside areas, but also offers an opportunity for resources within a community that has few of them. Mr. Reese believes the primary goal of East Cleveland Library is to serve its surrounding community. This program is very unique within an inner city environment and he is proud of its success.

Mr. Reese says that Ted Schwarz has complete autonomy of the program. The library does not limit him, nor suggest to him any speakers or topics. The conviction in

the professionalism of Ted Schwarz is so complete, that sometimes the director has no idea who is coming until he reads copies of the press releases.

Even though the services of the presenters and the speaker do not demand any financial compensation, the library administration shows its support by including the program in its annual budget. Mr. Reese gave the researcher a copy of over thirty places that the library will send releases about upcoming speakers. It is interesting to note that an official release about the April 44th program did, in fact, mention personal writing assistance as a feature of the program whereas Ted Schwarz believed the public relations did not recognize it anymore.

Feedback was, to Mr. Reese, a good indictor of the program's effectiveness. He recalled one patron complaining that Mr. Schwarz was abrupt. But on all other accounts, praise has been positive concerning both the program and Mr. Schwarz. Mr. Reese wants to continue the program as long as he can. As important as Mr. Schwarz is to the program, the library would seek alternative ways to continue the program should he ever leave.

Questionnaire Results

Questionnaires, consent forms, and stamped return envelopes were given to participants of the program at the last two meetings attended by the researcher. Since the groups were large, the researcher had copies available on a table next to the exit so participants could take one when they left. At the fourth meeting, copies were physically handed out. Participants were first asked if they received one earlier. No one refused to take a questionnaire. From the remaining copies left each time, it was estimated that thirty-five questionnaires were sent out. The results are based on ten that were returned to the researcher. A copy of the questionnaire can be seen in Appendix E and the program participant consent form is in Appendix B. Furthermore, return rates to the questionnaires of both programs are represented in Appendix F.

Age of the participants ranged between 18 to over 75 years, with half (5) falling between 46 to 60 years. All participants had some college experience with half again studying or having a degree on the graduate level. On their occupational background, 7 out of the 10 participants who responded identified themselves as professionals.

Library use was evenly distributed. Two participants each said they used the library once a week, once a month, 3 to 6 times a year, and once or twice a year. 90% of the participants borrowed materials, while 40% obtained material from a librarian. Other services received no more than 30% consistency. Two participants claimed to use all the services listed. Half of the questionnaires sent back stated the participant never was in a library program at the library before, but all said they plan to attend more programs in the future.

Results pertaining to the workshop revealed that 100% of the participants that filled the questionnaire said the topic attracted them to the program. Also, 7 out of 10 saw the opportunity for intellectual stimulation as a reason to come. Four answered that meeting people was also a reason for coming to the program. Of the importance of various aspects of the program, 7 out of 10 thought learning about resources was of great value. Other responses did not constitute a pattern and some aspects, such as sharing work with others, contribution of the presenter, and hearing what others had to say were either of no or little value, or marked "NO". As a learning experience, 7 participants thought the quality of the program was excellent, and the other 3 thought it to be good. In reverse, 7 thought the relevance of the topics to be good, whereas 3 believed such relevance to be an excellent learning experience.There appeared to be confusion about the question and answer period of the program and group participation. Seven people thought participation was good or excellent whereas 3 put down "NO". Likewise, the presenter's role in drawing people out and in encouraging writing got good or excellent marks from some and "NO" marks by others.
27

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

Each of the writing programs has unique characteristics that can be identified as assisting in their longevity and indicating possibilities for improvement. Similar components within both programs can also be described.

The Geauga Writers Workshop is an opportunity for writers to share their work with others and receive feedback. Each participant could proceed at his own pace. No one was judged based on the work presented, but rather could use group comments for suggestions toward revision and marketability. The small group setting allowed for adequate representation of individual reading and opportunities for others to respond.

The Geauga Writers Workshop has a presenter who is both a librarian and a writer. This combination has contributed greatly to the impact of the program. Ms. Rome could prepare for the workshop at her convenience when reference duties are at a lesser demand. She would be there and was not hurried for time. The administration already knew of her working habits and professionalism as a librarian. Since her credentials as a writer were commendable, it was easy to give autonomy to her without much hesitation. The feedback to Ms. Rome directly and from questionnaire results indicated she was an excellent teacher and cared for the progress of individual work. The observations of her encouragement and ability to stay longer than required reflected her dedication. As long as Ms. Rome is a librarian at Middlefield, it appears the program will continue to run.

The library administration recognized that the workshop served a valuable service to adults in the community interested in writing. They were aware of requests of assistance and feedback from patrons while Ms. Rome was working reference. By

extending little financial compensation other than a few hours a month for Ms. Rome's salary, however, the library appeared to be offering minimal support of the writing program. A lack of promotional effort might have accounted for the low turnout as much as the nature of the program itself. This puts a burden on Ms. Rome who acknowledged that more time and money for public relations might bring in more participants. Although the program appeared to be effective giving a smaller group more individual attention, it is commendable that she wanted to have more people benefit from this program. And, even though the library is supporting the program financially, nothing has been gained in terms of time and money. Instead of answering questions about writing on her shift, Ms. Rome now does preparation work for the meeting. Also, the library must have another staff member cover the reference area while the workshop is going on.

Write On, Cleveland !, the program at East Cleveland Public Library, is a resource for writers to learn more about the practicalities of getting published. The program used guest speakers in the field to lecture and answer questions. Indeed, 100% of the participants that returned the questionnaire said they were attracted to the program because of the topic. Although there was also personal guidance offered by the presenter, there were no hands-on evaluation or readings of individual work within the program. Because of the nature of the topics and the expertise of the speakers, the turnout for this program was considerably higher. The program was scheduled for four hours a meeting and is offered twice a month. The presenter and all speakers donated their time. These components represented continuous, varied opportunities for writers at no cost.

Ted Schwarz's list of credentials speak for themselves. His reputation was noticed by the library director and the program's concept was formed. His efforts and connections were remarkable, and by his own account, he has missed only five or six

meetings. His ability to get varied speakers on a consistent level truly was amazing. His wiliness to offer personal assistance as well as referrals was an asset to the program. The tools and resources were the features of this program, and Mr. Schwarz's expertise was to bring all the elements together. Such emphasis on resources and networking might suggest a librarian personality. Mr. Schwarz was a writer, though, and not a librarian. He did not see this program as library service as much as it was a writers' resource center. He did not show the nurturing and patient qualities of a librarian. He has had great success as a teacher, but the program was succeeding with his role of a moderator and organizer. Again, results have proven his dedication to individuals and their work, but observations for the study did not find the majority of participants coming for individual evaluation.

Gregory Reese, the library director, put all trust and control of the program into the hands of Mr. Schwarz. His thinking, though, reflected the value that the participants saw in the program: that the content, not the presenter, was the core. Mr. Reese came up with the original idea, and although he was fortunate to find someone as dedicated and talented as Ted Schwarz to head the program, he was also committed to the notion the program would continue whomever ran it. The administration was backing up the program with an active public relations campaign. Other publications (such as *The Ohio Writer*) than those the library submitted releases to ran announcements as well. Some guest speakers also promoted their date within their own publications and contacts.

The ethnic background information of this program was purposely omitted from the questionnaire result because the researcher got a more accurate measurement by counting at the four meetings. Of the 82 participants that attended, 31 were black (see Summary of Field Notes in Appendix I). The total count indicated 38% of the participants attending the Write On! Cleveland program were black. It was unclear

how many participants were actually from East Cleveland (all of the participants who responded to the questionnaire had some college experience which does not correspond with the demographics of the area). More research is needed, but if patrons of the community are attending this program, the philosophy as aspired by Mr. Reese to serve the immediate community is working.

Similar elements of both programs that added to their effectiveness was the uniqueness of the program, the dedication of an individual to the program, and a library administration that was supportive on some level. The Geauga Writers Workshop was the only adult writers workshop that the researcher could find that currently has a librarian as its presenter. The fact that it was a program offering services to the needs of such a small segment of the community was equally unique. Linda Rome brought excellent qualities and skills from both professions to the program. She was dedicated, organized, and committed to the individual. The program existed only if she was willing to continue with presenting it. The library administration recognized that this service is used by members of the community and was willing to support Ms. Rome indefinitely by offering financial compensation for her efforts.

The Write On, Cleveland! program succeeded in its ability to present guest speakers on various aspects about writing and publishing. The consistency and diversity of topics assured a large and varied turnout of participants. As with the Middlefield program, no cost was passed to the patron. Mr. Schwarz was tireless in his attempts to locate quality speaker and interesting topics. His willingness to review individual work was an added feature to the workshop and gave the program a more comprehensive approach than merely presenting resources. The dedication and expertise of both the presenter and guest speakers accounted for a quality program. The researcher had doubts whether the program would maintain its consistency and

quality if Mr. Schwarz did leave. The administration at East Cleveland promoted and supported the program with a personal relations budget and provision of extended space and time, as well as refreshments.

Elements identified in both programs that could restrict growth or needed improvement were promotion, autonomy of the presenters, and lack of evaluation of the program by the library administration. The Geauga Writers Group had little promotion or announcement that the program existed other than the flyer by the library's main door. Only one other library branch (Chardon) had any posted information. The program was effective under Linda Rome's guidance, but its existence was pivotal on the fact it was of little cost to the library. Promotion was needed, but no money was allocated for the program other than salary. As stated before, the program was created, maintained, and moderated by Linda Rome. The program's existence not only depends on its low cost, but also on Ms. Rome's continuing involvement. If she decides not to be involved, the program would not continue. Other than the inability of the administration to promote and offer more financial support, the complete autonomy of Linda Rome created a difficult atmosphere for evaluation. The administration had little information on the effectiveness of the program. No records were kept and no regular meetings were held to voice concerns. It becomes more difficult to offer assistance to a program one knows little about. The administration has acknowledged to the researcher that it believed the program to be a valuable service. Promotion and feedback to Ms. Rome certainly would verify that position in a stronger sense.

Even though the financial support of Write On, Cleveland! was through public relations money, the effect was unclear. Mr. Schwarz thought little of the promotional campaign and believed personal assistance was not even featured in the releases. The researcher was unclear that the personal assistance was part of the program as

well. Further questions into the matter found that not only were there inconsistencies in what was promoted, some features were not promoted at all. At the interview, Mr. Schwarz mentioned that the program also established a collection of reference books for writers. The researcher had no knowledge of this and never observed it being promoted at the four meetings. The program would benefit with a more consistent promotion of the entire program. Giving the presenter complete autonomy could have ramifications. If Mr. Schwarz leaves, it is certain Mr. Reese would attempt to continue with the program. But as stated, it would be difficult to replace Mr. Schwarz's overall expertise and networking abilities. On the other hand, Mr. Schwarz 's prolificacy as a writer should not be mistaken to suggest he is an authority on other topics, or even all topics about writing. He mentioned that he would interject if he felt a speaker was giving misinformation. Such interpretation invites one to question if Mr. Schwarz could give misinformation himself, especially when he revealed he filled in on a topic that an expert could not present. The library administration admitted not even knowing who was speaking at times till the promotion was set in motion. Evaluation of both the topics and the presentation of those topics certainly should at least be known by an administration that is going to support a program and then stand on it laurels.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The two adult writing programs observed in this case study reflected lifelong learning theories put into practice. The results of the questionnaires indicated that 75% of those that answered were attracted to these programs for an opportunity for intellectual stimulation. Within a group participation, patrons repeatedly came back for insight and evaluation of their creative work. A consistent turnout of both regular and new participants to hear guest speakers indicated patrons wanted information on a variety of topics. It was apparent that both programs provided a specific service.

Although different in format and approach, components were identified in both programs by the researcher that assured their existence and effectiveness. Each program offered a unique service at no cost to the participants. They depended on the insight and dedication of individuals that were dedicated to the quality and consistency of the program. Also, library administrations recognized the importance of the programs through financial support of paid salaries and promotion. It was unclear if any changes in these components would alter the programs' success. Would more promotion, for example, of the Geauga Writers Workshop attract more participants and would greater numbers effect individual evaluation time? And if Ted Schwarz left Write-On! Cleveland, could East Cleveland Library find anyone with his background and willingness to devote his/her time? Other adult writing programs need be studied so that a working model of successful components can be developed.

Writers are everywhere and libraries should entice them to use the library as actively as they do readers. These two writing programs not only fill a void, they offer with their unique structures an alternative to continuous, adult programming.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULES

Geauga Writers Workshop (Middle field Public Library)

1. Program Meetings
   - January 7, 1998
   - February 5, 1998
   - March 5, 1998 *
   - April 2, 1998 *

2. Presenter Interview
   - March 6, 1998

3. Library Administration Meeting
   - March 17, 1998

Write-on! Cleveland (East Cleveland Public Library)

1. Program Meetings
   - February 7, 1998
   - March 7, 1998
   - March 21, 1998 *
   - April 4, 1998 *

2. Presenter Interview
   - April 13, 1998

3. Library Administration Meeting
   - March 23, 1998

* Questionnaire Handouts

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

March 5, 1998

Dear Library Patron:

I am a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University. As part of the requirements for my master's degree I am conducting a study on adult writing programs in public libraries. The enclosed questionnaire elicits information that will help me to describe the effectiveness of these programs in terms of satisfaction and content presentation. The results of this study will be reported to both the administration of this library and the presenter. This information could be useful to other researchers in developing a program model. Also, your cooperation will be beneficial to you as it will help sustain and improve service in this and other similar programs.

Confidentiality and anonymity are guaranteed as you do not need to sign your name to individual questionnaires; only the investigator has access to the data. There is no obligation of any kind should you choose not to participate in this study and you may withdraw at any time without penalty. While your cooperation is essential to the success of the study, it is, of course, voluntary. If so desired, please contact me by mail or telephone and a copy of the results of the study will be sent directly to you.

If you have any further questions, please contact me at (440) 254-2308 or Dr.Connie Van Fleet, my research advisor, at (330) 672-2782. If you have further questions regarding research at Kent State University you may contact Dr. M. Thomas Jones, at (330) 672-2851.

Thank you very much for your cooperation; it is much appreciated. You may return the questionnaire to me in the attached self-addressed stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Gary Esmonde
Graduate Student
8092 Sumner Road
Thompson, Ohio 44086

APPENDIX C

PRESENTER CONSENT FORM

March 5, 1998

Dear Presenter:

I am a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University. As part of the requirements for my master's degree I am conducting a study on adult writing programs in public libraries. This will involve active observation of your program and a questionnaire to participants. Also, an interview with you will help describe the effectiveness of these programs in terms of organization, satisfaction, and content presentation. Copies of the study will be sent to the administration of the library. You will receive a copy as well. This information could be useful to other researchers in developing a program model. Your cooperation will be beneficial as it will help sustain and improve service in this and other similar programs.

Anonymity and confidentiality of the program participants will be observed, but library administration and presenters will be identified and you may be quoted in the paper. There is no obligation of any kind should you choose not to participate in this study and you may withdraw at any time without penalty. While your cooperation is essential to the success of the study, it is, of course, voluntary. If an interview can be arranged, please sign the consent statement below. Please keep one copy for your records and return the other copy in the attached self-addressed envelope with a suggested date we could meet. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (440) 254-2308 or Dr.Connie Van Fleet, my research advisor, at (330) 672-2782. If you have further questions regarding research at Kent State University you may contact Dr. M. Thomas Jones, at (330) 672-2851.

Thank you very much for your cooperation; it is much appreciated.
Sincerely,

Gary Esmonde
Graduate Student
8092 Sumner Road
Thompson, Ohio 44086

CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to take part in this project. I know what is expected and can stop at any time.

_____ _____

Signature Date

APPENDIX D

LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION CONSENT FORM

March 5, 1998

Dear Library Administration:

I am a graduate student in the School of Library and Information Science at Kent State University. As part of the requirements for my master's degree I am conducting a study on adult writing programs in public libraries. This will involve active observation of your program and a questionnaire to participants. Also, an interview with you will help describe the effectiveness of these programs in terms of organization, satisfaction, and content presentation. Copies of the study will be sent to the administration of the library. You will receive a copy as well. This information could be useful to other researchers in developing a program model. Your cooperation will be beneficial as it will help sustain and improve service in this and other similar programs.

Anonymity and confidentiality of the program participants will be observed, but library administration and presenters will be identified and you may be quoted in the paper. There is no obligation of any kind should you choose not to participate in this study and you may withdraw at any time without penalty. While your cooperation is essential to the success of the study, it is, of course, voluntary. If an interview can be arranged, please sign the consent statement below. Please keep one copy for your records and return the other copy in the attached self-addressed envelope with a suggested date we could meet. If you have any further questions, please contact me at (440) 254-2308 or Dr.Connie Van Fleet, my research advisor, at (330) 672-2782. If you have further questions regarding research at Kent State University you may contact Dr. M. Thomas Jones, at (330) 672-2851.

Thank you very much for your cooperation; it is much appreciated.
Sincerely,

Gary Esmonde
Graduate Student
8092 Sumner Road
Thompson, Ohio 44086

CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to take part in this project. I know what is expected and can stop at any time.

_____ _____

Signature Date

APPENDIX E

PARTICIPANT PROGRAM EVALUATION

Please answer the following questions to help us plan future programs. Remember all answers are anonymous.

A. Program Information

1. What attracted you to the program? (Check as many as apply.)

   a. ____ The topic

   b. ____ Friends participating

   c. ____ The presenter

   d. ____ The guest speaker

   e. ____ Opportunity to meet people

   f ____ Opportunity for intellectual stimulation

   g. ____ Convenient location

   h. ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

2. In your estimation, how important were the following aspects of the program? (Please check one response for each question.)

	of no value	of little value	of moderate value	of great value
a. Contribution of the presenter	____	____	____	____
b. Contribution of guest speaker	____	____	____	____
c. Hearing what others had to say	____	____	____	____
d. Learning about resources	____	____	____	____
e. Sharing your work with others	____	____	____	____
f. Visits from other writers	____	____	____	____

A. Program Information (continued)

3. As a learning experience, how would you judge the following? (Please check one response for each question.)

	excellent	good	fair	poor
a. Acquired writing skills	____	____	____	____
b. Location of program	____	____	____	____
c. Group participation	____	____	____	____
d. Quality of the program	____	____	____	____
e. Relevance of the topics	____	____	____	____
f. Role of presenter as a teacher	____	____	____	____
g. Role of presenter in drawing people out	____	____	____	____
h. Role of presenter in encouraging writing	____	____	____	____

B. Library Information

4. How often have you used the library in the past year? (Do not include any sessions of this writing program.)

   a. ____ Not at all

   b. ____ Once or twice

   c. ____ 3 to 6 times

   d. ____ At least once a month

5. Which library service did you use? (Check all that apply.)

   a. ____ Attended programs (Do not include this writing program.)

   b. ____ Borrowed materials

   c. ____ Obtained information from resources within the library

   d. ____ Obtained information from a librarian

   e. ____ Received materials through a delivery service

   f. ____ Used the OPLIN terminals

   g. ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

B. Library Information (continued)

6. Have you ever participated in a library program here before?

   a. ____ No

   b. ____ Yes

7. Do you plan to attend any more programs in the future?

   a. ____ No

   b. ____ Yes

C. Background Information (This data will be for analysis only and will not be used for identification purposes.)

8. Sex

   a. ____ Male

   b. ____ Female

9. Age

   a. ____ Under 18

   b. ____ 18-30

   c. ____ 31-45

   d. ____ 46-60

   e. ____ 61-75

   f. ____ Over 75

10. Ethnic Background

   a. ____ Asian

   b. ____ Black

   c. ____ Caucasian

   d. ____ Native American

   e ____ Other (Please specify.) _____

11. Education (Check highest level attained.)

   a. ____ Less than 8 years b. ____ Some high school

C. Background Information (continued)

c. ____ High school / GOD graduate

d. ____ Some college

e. ____ College graduate

f. ____ Graduate study or degree

12. Occupation (Check one.)

a. _____ Business

b. _____ Homemaking

c. _____ Industry / Trade

d. _____ Professional

e. _____ Services

f. _____ Other (Please specify.) _____

Additional Comments and Suggestions:

Thank you for your time and response

APPENDIX F

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN RATES

LOCATION	NUMBER DISTRIBUTED	NUMBER RETURNED	RETURN RATE
Middle field	6	6	100%
East Cleveland	35	10	28.5%
Total	41	16	39%

APPENDIX G

PRESENTER INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is the history of the program?
2. How did the idea of the program originate?
3. How did you become involved with the program?
4. What are your qualifications in regard to this program?
5. Are you compensated for your services?
6. How much preparation and time do you put into each session?
7. How long have you been with the program?
8. Are there any limitations placed on you?
9. Are there any suggestions given to you?
10. Do you have any help with the program?
11. How do you measure the program's effectiveness?
12. Are there any changes you would like to see in the program?
13. What kind of feedback have you received?
14. Do you plan to continue with the program?

APPENDIX H

LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What is the history of the program?
2. How did the idea of the program originate?
3. Was the library involved with the program's creation in any way?
4. How is the program funded?
5. How is the library involved with the program other than funding?
6. Are there any limitations placed on the presenter?
8. Are there any suggestions given to the presenter?
9. Has the program changed in any way since its beginning?
10. Has there been any public feedback to the program?
11. How does the library measure the program's value to the community?
12. If the program changed its current status, would the library seek alternative ways to continue the service?

APPENDIX I

FIELD NOTES

Middle field Writing Program

January 7

-6:30PM - 8:30PM
-noted flyer program flyer at main door; observed layout of meeting room
-six participants, presenter
-asked individual participants of writing progress
-introduction to journal writing; read excerpts about journal writing; gave printed resources
-three writing assignments where each participant's response was discussed
1. Accomplishment for 1997 - Take a moment to assess your progress. List any accomplishments or forward progress you achieved in your writing life in the last year.
2. Ten Tiny Changes - List ten changes you'd like to make for yourself, significant to the small or vice versa concerning your writing life.
3. Goals for 1998 in your Writing Life - What do you want to accomplish with your writing this year? What are your hopes? What intrigues you? What are you afraid of?
-evaluation of individual work
1. chapter from mystery novel
2. science fiction story

February 5

-6:30PM - 9:30PM
-four participants, presenter
-asked individual participants of writing progress
-introduction to writing motivation books; gave printed resources
-writing assignment where each participant's response was discussed
Writing Prompts (choose one) - Write a story about iris, marbles, snow, kerosene lantern, door transom, being late, meeting an old friend, or cheese.
-evaluation of individual work
1. chapters from memoirs
2. children's story
3. poem (researcher's)
4. chapter from mystery novel
-researcher announced intentions of case study; groups generally interested

Middlefield Writing Program (continued)

March 5

-6:30PM - 8:10PM
-three participants, presenter
-asked individual participants of writing progress
-presenter talked of personal experiences with submissions
-no writing assignment
-evaluation of individual work
    1. essay/magazine article (short discussion on submission strategies)
    2. chapters from memoirs
-researcher handed out questionnaires to group
-*noticed throughout meeting there were no visible reactions to knowledge study or any different approaches to researcher than from first two meetings

April 2

-6:30PM - 8:15PM
-five participants, presenter
-asked individual participants of writing progress
-announcement of participant sending out mystery novel
-overviews of publishers and submissions, comparisons of computer printers, and internee resources (short discussion on print vs. electronic formats of same literary magazines)
-two writing assignments where each participant's response was discussed
    1. Go for ten minutes onto your back porch.
    2. Think of your junk drawer. Go over its contents and tell the story of one item no one knows you are saving.
-presenter read excerpts from "Long Quiet Highway" by Natalie Goldberg
-evaluation of individual work
    1. fragment of a mystery
    2. poems with mythological overtones (short discussion of publishing possibilities)
    3. chapters from memoirs
    4. short story (researcher's)
-researcher handed out questionnaires to group

general observations

-presenter was cordial, patient, very supportive of all writing efforts
-presenter was looking at creativity- did not comment on inflection or correct grammar
-presenter stayed overtime if participant was reading or if group was talking
-group was interested in each others work
-good feedback to individual work
-everyone had equal voice; no condescending attitudes

47

East Cleveland Writing Program

February 7

-1:00PM - 5:00PM
-fourteen participants (six Black), presenter, guest speaker
-in GED room, very cramped, loud noises distracting
-coffee and tea
-presenter gave upcoming dates and topics; introduced guest speaker
-guest speaker: Mike Agnes of World Publishing
-topic: dictionaries
selection and acquisition, qualities of various brands, history, the Webster name, prescriptive vs. non-prescriptive, abridged and unabridged, dialogue usage, speciality dictionaries, how words change in meaning, offensive words, features of Webster's New World Dictionary, best dictionaries for writers
-two handouts of dictionary bibliographies
-questions and answers to guest speaker
-individual work of participants given to presenter for review
-*meeting was nearly four hours long with one fifteen minute break; everyone was attentive and no one left early

March 7

-1:00PM - 3:30PM, no breaks
-nineteen participants (four Black), director, guest speaker
-in auditorium
-coffee and tea
-presenter absent, director of library made introduction of guest speaker (director left immediately after introduction)
-guest speaker: Aura Ensley, managing editor of *Cleveland Parent* magazine
-topic: writing for parenting periodicals
how to write parenting articles, picking topics, approaches to the market, factors in publishing, knowing your readers, respecting editors, how to layout submissions, pay and word count, online rights
-handout: "The Ten Commandments of Feature Writing"
-questions and answers to guest speaker

March 21

-1:10PM - 4:00PM, 20 minute break
-twenty-eight participants (thirteen Black), presenter, guest speaker
-in auditorium
-coffee and tea
-presenter stated no individual work ready to give back; introduced speaker
-guest speaker: Susan Hall, public relations specialist at Thigpen and ADsociates, an advertising and public relations firm
-topic: writing in the public relations field

East Cleveland Writing Program (continued)

March 2

freelancing experiences, myths about public relations, ability to work for others, information layout on page, knowing different styles of newspapers, differences between paid and unpaid advertising, knowing your client, benefits of freelancing

-handouts of releases by Susan Hall of African American Heritage Celebration
-questions and answers to guest speaker

April 4

-1:00PM - 4:00PM
-twenty-one participants (eight Black), presenter, guest speaker
-in auditorium
-coffee and tea
-presenter gave upcoming dates and topics; introduced guest speaker
-guest speaker: Kevin Miller, literary agent for Odyssey Entertainment
-topic: literary agents and writers

gave personal background history of documentary film writer, producer, film writer, and cinematographer, working as liaison between writers and editors, the ego of not wanting to cut or edit, percentage of selling rights, patience fro manuscripts to be read, non-fiction marketing

-questions and answers to guest speaker

general observations

-1st room crowded, auditorium roomy
-coffee and tea. . .nice touch
-programs long, need the breaks
-no one left during 1st, 3 left during the 2nd, 2 in the 3rd, 4th okay
-presenter didn't do much, just announces speaker and sits down
-presenter looked attentive, asked a lot of questions
-presenter twice paraphrased Susan Hall; kind of annoying
-presenter participating in asking questions
-all questions were taken seriously, all were answered
-one man fell asleep during third meeting
-presenter observed talking to participants about individual work at 1st and 4th meetings

REFERENCE LIST

American Library Association. 1997. *Handbook of organization*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Arnott, Joanne. 1995. *Breasting the waves: On writing and healing*. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers.

Baker, Sheridan. 1983. Writing as learning. In *Florum: Essays on theory and practice in the teaching of writing*, ed. Patricia L. Stock, 224-227. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Bolte, Charles. 1977. *Libraries and the arts and humanities*. Syracuse: Gaylord Bros.

Bongartz, Roy. 1982. Talking in the library. *Publishers Weekly*, 11 June, 32-34.

Brand, Alice Glarden. 1980. *Therapy in writing*. Lexington, MA: Heath and Company.

Cross, Patricia K. 1978. *The missing link: Connecting adult learners to learning resources*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Dolnick, Sandy. 1980. *Friends of libraries sourcebook*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Hall, Lavern. 1995. *Writing in Ohio*. 2d ed. Cleveland: Writer's World Press.

Hogan, Judy. 1989. *Watering the roots of democracy*. Chapel Hill: Carolina Wren Press.

_____, ed. 1984. *Roadmap: An anthology*. Chapel Hill: Carolina Wren Press.

_____, ed. 1987. *A living culture in Durham*. Chapel Hill: Carolina Wren Press.

Knowlton, Marty. 1993. The future of lifelong learning. In *Lifelong learning: An imperative in today's society*, ed. Alphonse F. Trezza, 3-11. New York: G.K. Hall and Co.

Ludlam, Jane. 1980. *Presenting readings and workshops*. New York: Poets and Writers, Inc.

Moltz, Kathleen. 1979. *Library and information services for enhancing lifelong learning*. Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

Monroe, Margaret, and Kathleen M. Heim. 1991. *Partners for lifelong learning: Libraries and adult education.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Moore, Nick. 1989. *Measuring the performance of public libraries.* Paris: United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.

Nickerson, Sheila B. 1984. *Writers in the public library.* Hamden, CT: Library Professional Publications.

Ohio Arts Council. 1997. *Arts in Education.* Online, updated 25 July. Available: http://www.oac.ohio.gov/AIE/AIE.HTM#Artist-in-Residence Program.

Parker, Robert, and Vera Goodkin. 1987. *The consequences of writing.* Upper Montclair, NJ: Boyton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Pellegrino, Marjorie. 1995. Amateur authors in Arizona: The Tucson writer's project. *American Libraries* (March): 218-220.

Penland, Patrick. 1978. Adult self-planned learning. *Public Libraries* 17 (Summer): 6-7

Rayward, W. Boyd. 1980. The writing in Chicago program, an evaluation. *Public Libraries* 19 (Summer): 43-45.

Reference and User Services Association. 1997. *Adult programming: A manual for libraries.* Chicago: American Library Association.

Rubin, Rhea. 1997. *Humanities programming.* New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

Smith, Frank. 1994. *Writing and the writer.* 2d ed. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tough, Allen. 1979. *The adult's learning projects: A fresh approach to theory and practice in adult learning.* 2d ed. Austin: Learning Concepts.

Van Fleet, Connie. 1990. Lifelong learning theory and the provision of adult services. In *Adult services: An enduring focus for public libraries*, ed. Kathleen M. Heim and Danny P. Wallace, 166-211. Chicago: American Library Association.

Ziegler, Alan. 1981. *The writing workshop, vol. 1.* New York: Teachers and Writers Collaborative.